घूमते हैं। दूसरे से जब मैंने यह सवाल किया तो उसने भी यह कहा दफा हो जाओ। तीसरे कांस्टेबल से पूछा जो नया लड़का सा था उसने भी यही कहा चले जाओ। यह रोजाना एम० पी० के साथ होता है। इसका आपको कोई इलाज करना चाहिए। (**व्यवधान**)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If anybody has any such grievance, let me know. I will convey it to the concerned Ministry.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): The Government will look into it.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार): आप का उनको कहिन चाहिए ..... (**व्यवधान**)

उपसभापति: आप बोलते ही चले जायेंगे? आप कुछ काम भी करना चाहते हैं? मैंने कहा है कि आपकी जो फीलिंग्ज है वह मिनिस्टर फार पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स को कही जायेंगी वह गवर्नमेंट तक पहुंचा देंगे। वहां भी सूटेबल एक्शन लेने की जरूरत होगी ली जायेगी। बार-बार आप इस तरह से मत उठिये। (**व्यवधान**)

I have said that this will be conveyed to the concerned Ministry and they will take suitable action. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I have already mentioned to the Chair.... (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to sit down when the Chair says. This is an elementary rule which you should know.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव: क्यों न उठे ..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will not go on record.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव: *

उपसभापति: हमने आपको बताना है कि आपकी जो फीलिंग्ज हैं, आप जो बता रहे है मेरे पास पहुंच गयी हैं। वे पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर को बताकर गवर्नमेंट तक पहुचा दी जायेगी। एक्शन लेने के लिए कह दूंगी। इसके बावजूद भी आप बार-बार बोले जा रहे है। यह ठीक नहीं है। (**व्यवधान**)

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव: *

उपसभापति: बापू कालदते जी ने हम से पहले परमिशन मांगी थी मैंने उनको एलाऊ किया था। इसीलिए वह बोले थे। अभी आपने जो कहा है उसको हमने एग्री कर लिया है कि हम एक्शन नहीं लेंगे। हम यह कह रहे हैं कि हमने पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर को कह दिया है। आप फिर भी बार-बार बोले जा रहे हैं। (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I have already stated. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Now, the Minister has to reply to the short duration discussion.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION Re. Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement—*Contd.*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Madam Deputy Chairman, with your permission before I reply to the debate I would like to convey to the Government of Sri Lanka the feelings of the House about the dastardly attack that was made on the President and his colleagues yesterday in Colombo and to send our condolences to the bereaved family of the Minister who unfortunately passed away and also to wish speedy recovery to the Ministers and others who were injured in the dastardly incident yesterday. I am sure the House will unanimously agree to the suggestion of mine.

*Not recorded.

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

(Interruption)

Madam, may I now refer to the discussion that took place yesterday in the House. May I say how very grateful I am to the honourable Members who participated in this important debate on this important subject. It is their interest as much as it is ours to see that Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement is fully and totally implemented,, as early as possible, so that peace and tranquility can be restored to Sri Lanka. I am very glad to report to the House that since the Agreement was signed on the 29th of July, the Agreement has not been violated in any manner there have been no serious incidents of any kind, in the eastern province or in the northern province and the ceasefire have helped. I would like to make one or two preliminary observations before I take up the points made by each distinguished Member. As I said in the other House yesterday, let us look at the senario in which if this Agreement had not been signed. What then would have been the situation in Sri Lanka. We know the history of the last four years, particularly of the last six to eight months when the situation in Sri Lanka had assumed proportions which were causing us concern in this counrty and concern in the region. There was an economic blockade. There was death and destruction in the northern and eastern provinces. Now peace has returned. The people of Sri Lanka and the people of Tamil Nadu in India have heaved a sigh of relief. Children can go to schools. Parents do not have to worry about the welfare of their children. People can go to work. That all this has been achieved is not a small thing bearing in mind what had been happening in Sri Lanka for the last so many months and years. Now, the implementation is progressing satisfactorily. There has been some delay in the laying down of arms. This, as I said the other day, is acceptable to us; we have to have a certain element of flexibility. The militant groups had stocked their arms in various parts of the country and it will be difficult to get them out at once, but the exercise is going on. We may not have adhered to the time stipulated. Some flexibility is acceptable to us, as I said the other day.

Now, a reference has been made as to whether there is any contingency planning. Yes, there is contingency planning. That is the duty of any responsible Government, any responsible Foreign Office, to plan for a contingency where things might go wrong. We hope and pray that things will not go wrong. But if they do, we do have contingency plan. We must realise that human beings are involved in this exercise. There are always imponderables. The unexpected can always happen. And as I said the other day, it is the duty of diplomats to anticipate the contingencies and plan for them as best as *they can, and this is being done. Diplo*macy, as I said, is an unending process, it is marathon, it continues and we have to combine stearfastness with flexibility. References have been made to the security environment. I will take up this matter when I answer questions that have been raised. The admantine truth is that we have arrived at a political solution of the ethnic problem. This is what we on this side have been saying. I remember the debates that have taken place in the House. When last time I spoke and said that we should be working for a settlement, for a political settlement, an honourable Member said that my speech was stupid. All that I can say now is that he was not happy in the use of language. We have arrived at a political solution and it has not been so easy to do it. It required a great deal of courage, a great deal of vision and a great deal of grasp of reality and I want here to pay tribute to the authors of this agreement, he President of Sri Lanka and the Prime Minister of India. And, Madam, this is not a matter which is partisan, it is a national matter involving the security of this country and of Sri Lanka and I think that if we have arrived at this agreemest and if the agreement is hold, it is a matter of satisfaction. I do not know why efforts are being made to discover loopholes in the agreement. In any exercise of this kind, as we go along, if we find that there are some lacunae, we will put them right. Given the necessary atmosphere and climate and [illegible] standing and goodwill we should

our objective. I am sure this is the objective of honourable Members also. By and large, Madam, honourable Members have supported the agreement because they cannot possibly say that they are not in favour of a political solution of this problem. The emergency is being ended, amnesty is being declared, and the prisoners will be released. We have been able to arive at a solution of the problem between two non-aligned countries. It has strengthened the non-aligned movement and it has strengthened SAARC. It was good of Sri Lanka to come to the SAARC meeting which they did though initially they had some reservations. We were able to carry on our dialogue with them bilaterally and this has produced results. I am not saying that nothing has happened in four years. A lot of efforts were made. But the culmination was on the 29th July and the credit for this belongs rightly to the Prime Minister of India and the President of Sri Lanka.

Madam, the unity, integrity and sovereignty of Sri Lanka have been upheld. If this agreement had not been signed on the 29th July, then there was every possibility of this ethnic conflict spreading to the other parts of Sri Lanka because the Tamils are not confined only to the eastern and northern provinces, but they are living all over the country. Out of a total population of 17 or 18 million, there are two million Tamils who are living all over the country. If a situation were to be created there, the kind of situation that is there in Lebanon, then it would have been a very serious matter for all of us. But that has been contained and this agreement has been welcomed very widely by, as I said the other day in the other House, from Washington to Moscow and from Peking to Peru. One or two discordant voices are there in our neighbourhood. But this is a chronic condition and if anything positive happens here, they are critical of it. But, above all, the Tamils have welcomed it, the Tamils of Sri Lanka and the Tamils of India, and this is a very important consideration.

Madam, I would like to come to the points raised by the honourable Members and I will begin with Shri Gopalsamy. He said that the militants had not been taken into confidence. Now, with all due respect, Madam, I would like to say that this is not correct. We had been in touch with leadership of the LTTE and the leadership of the other groups throughout. With Mr. Prabhakaran and his colleagues, we had very lengthy discussion in Jaffna, in Madras and in Delhi.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Have they agreed to your package proposals? That was the question.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am coming to the point and I am coming to your question. I cas assure you that yours is probably the one discordant voice. The people of Tamil Nadu have welcomed this, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has welcomed this and the people of Sri Lanka and the Tamils have welcomed this.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He is the main force of the militants. Again you have said that most of the Tamils have welcomed the Agreement. What was Mr. Prabhakaran's reaction on August 4 when he made his speech near Jaffna? He said that it was imposed on us and that it is for the benefit of India and Sri Lanka. Did Mr. Prabhakaran accept your formula?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Indignation is not going to help you. You are not going to provoke me.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am not provoking you. You said something...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Madam, do I carry on this discussion or Mr. Gopalsamy wants to take over the proceedings? If he wants, he is most welcome to do so.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You carry on.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: If he is going to have a running commentary....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: No. No. If you don't want me to put any questions, I won't put.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: What I am trying to say is that throughout the debate I did not interrupt a single Member and I would expect the hon. Member to extend to me a similar courtsey. That is the basic and fundamental duty of any parliamentarian.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: When you give the reply, can I seek one or two clarifications? That is the practice.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I will give you every single clarification. That is what I am here for. We are very conscious of the fact that the understanding and the goodwill of the LTTE is paramount and fundamental for the success of the Agreement. It has been our endeavour to keep in touch with Mr. Prabhakaran. We have more frequent contacts with LTTE than you have or your pary has. We have been in touch with him every single day and every single hour for the last so many days. We know the difficulties of Mr. Prabhakakaran better than you do. We are doing our best to help him. This Agreement has been made possible to some extent by the sacrifices made by the L.T.T.E. groups we aware of that. What I am trying to say is that Mr. Prabhakaran had certain fears. His fear was as to what was going to happen to the security of his colleagues after they had laid down the arms. We have assured and President Jayewardene has assured his security. I have read his speech very carefully. I think his whole attitude has been helpful and very constructive. I would like to say this in this House as I said in the other House.

The Professor referred to the exchange of letters. These letters have the same status as the Agreement has. The Agreement has been arrived at not between two private individuals, not between Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Jayewardene as persons. They have signed the Agreement as head of their respective Government. That is the status of the Agreement and the letters. Within the law of Sri Lanka, it is not necessary to ratify it. As far as I am aware, when a constitutional amendment is made for combining the Eastern and Northern Provinces, then the necessary legislation will be placed before the Sri Lankan Parliament. Otherwise the President has the full authority.

The other point he made was that the Agreement had created a rift between the Sinnalese and the Tamils. The whole objective of this exercise is to heal the wounds all round. We are involved in a common undertaking of a common cause. The Government and the people of Sri Lanka and the Government and the people of India are involved in this task. I think everybody should join us in this exercise so that peace and amity reign forever in this beautiful island. We have taken up that exercise and we want to see it through. We would like the cooperation of the House and I am very glad that by and large we are getting it. Shri Kulkarni wished us well and wanted the Agreement to succeed. He referred to the various plus points which I would not repeat. And, similarly, Mr. Mohanan broadly speaking supported the Agreement.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): What about Israeli and US troops taking arms?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Madam, through you, I would like to inform him that there are no troops as such.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Volunteers

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: There are certain agencies who are working there. The Israelis have a presence in Sri Lanka. So do some Britishers, a private agency called Keeny-Meeny Enterprise, the K.M. Enterprise. We have been in touch with the Sri Lankan Government about this. The Agreement ensures that they will pull out, and that is no small achievement. Mr Mohanan said that this was the right step in the right direction and that this would ensure the unity and the territorial integrity of Sri Lanka. He also referred to some of the reservations of the LTTE which I have

already referred to. Mr. Jamir also welcomed the Agreement. He said that this was a new chapter. We happen to share this view and I am grateful for the support that he has given us. Similarly, Mr. John also welcomed the Agreement and said that this was a time to be deliberative, not celebrative. I entirely agree with him. I think, it has been commented here that there is a sense of euphoria on our side. I would like to say that we are taking the exersise extremely seriously. And in my judgement, to have any kind of euphoria would be non-adult. Shri Chimanbhai Mehta also supported the Agreement. He too wanted one or two clarifications which I have already given to the House.

Shri Gurupadaswamy mentioned that originally we were offering our good offices and now we had become a participant and that we had under-written the Agreement and that we were one of the guarantors. Yes, we are; we have underwritten this. It has been arrived at after a very careful thought with the full aggreement of the President of Sri Lanka. He also referred to the referendum and to the implementation. As I said in the other House if the referendum takes place, fine, if it does not take place, also fine because if it does not take place, then the north and the east are united and if it takes place, then we will have our observers there. We are associated with it, and the demographic changes that are taking place will, by December, 1988, have put right what needs to be put right. With regard to the implementation, as I said, for the last three weeks, we have confronted no major difficulty. For this we might thank all those people including the able and dedicated officials on both sides, our brothers from the Armed Forces who are conducting themselves in an exemplary fashion in a very sensitive and difficult situation. Mr. Reddy also referred to the fact that we had given up our role and had now involved directly in the exercise. Yes, we are. As you have said, it is a very heavy burden that is placed on our shoulders and we are exercising all our efforts to make this work succeed. He also referred to the differences within the Sri Lankan Government. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on the internal affairs of a friendly neighbouring country. He has asked whether the exercise of laying down the arms was going on satisfactorily. Yes, it is, not as rapidly as we would like it to. But you can understand, given the background, the passions and the emotions involved in it and the suspicions within the Tamil groups themselves, it will take a little time. You said that if the things did not go right then the Indian Army would be fighting on two fronts. We are conscious of the fact and we sincerely hope that this agonizing situation will not arise.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair.]

Now, Sir, I come to the intervention of Jaswant Singhji. He is one of the very few Members who has the enviable knack of putting a great deal in a very few words and he is one of the very few people who appreciates the virtues of an under-statement, a virtue which is generally lacking in Indian political affairs, where we generally indulge in verbal over-kill. The points that Jaswant Singhji raised I would like to answer because they were both very pertinent and they made me do some homework. Now, he asked how long will the Indian army stay in Sri Lanka, what precisely are the tasks and responsibilities ofthe Indian armed forces is the Governmment aware of the perils of peace-keeping forces? Now, the Indian armed forces have a very clearly defined role to play within the agreement. They are under the command of the President of Sri Lanka who is the head of the armed forces and their objectives and tasks are clear, they will work together with the Sri Lankan Government and the liaison and rapport that has been established between the armed forces of the two countries is really exemplary and praiseworthy. We are not having any difficulty and as soon as the implementation is complete, our forces will come back and this will be mutually agreed between the two Govvernments. We have also to work from ...

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : मद्रोदय, यह तो हमारे दल ने भी और देश के

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

लोगों ने भी इस एकोर्ड का समर्थन किया ही है, लेकिन अभी आप फौज के बारे में चर्चा कर रहे थे, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि कहीं ऐसा तो नहीं होगा कि जैसे दूसरी पृष्ठ भूमि में सोवियत वाले अफगानिस्तान में और अमरीका वाले वियतनाम में फंस गए थे, कहीं वैसे हम तो वहां जाकर नहीं फंसेंगे, इतनी ही गारंटी आप कर दें ?

श्री के० नटवर सिंह : देखिए दो तरफा मेहनत करी जायेगी, भगवान से प्रार्थना की जाएगी और आपका सहयोग चाहिए कि ऐसी स्थिति न आये कि हमें एक भी दिन वहां ज्यादा रहना पड़े।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : सहयोग है ही और सहयोग रहेगा। ..... (**व्यवधान**) फंसना नहीं चाहिएं इतना ही कह दीजिए ?

श्री के० नटवर सिंह : आपने आगाह किया है, ठीक है। यह चिंता हमको भी है, इस पर बहुत देर तक चर्चा हुई है। .... (**व्यवधान**)

The other thing he mentioned was that is the status of the letters exchanged. I have already mentioned that according to our legal experts they have the same status as the agreement which has been signed by the heads of the two Governments. Now, he has also raised the question of refugees. Now, this particular question had also been raised by Shri Gopalsamy. Repatriation of Indian citizens is not a new feature arising out of the agreement. We have merely referred to the agreements of 1964 and 1974 and 1986, which process has been held up for some time on account of the situation in Sri Lanka. There is no commitment by India in this agreement to take back any new stateless persons and, I think, I had answered a question in the Rajya Sabha yesterday on this particular matter. Now, with regard to devolution of package, this is a very important matter. A team of the concerned officials of the Government of India has reached Sri Lanka regarding the establishment of an interim administration. They will see when it starts working because elections are scheduled for the end of the year and we should have a viable acceptable working political instrumentality in Sri Lanka so that there is no hiatus and the militant groups do not have to sit idle but get involved at home and get involved in the running of the show themselves. He has also asked what would happen if the Sri Lankan Government does not pass the necessary legislation. I have already mentioned that in their Constitution this is not necessary. All that is necessary is to make the Constitutional amendments so that the North and the East become one. These are the amendments which the Sri Lankan President will propose as and when the time comes. Now, I go to Shri Ram Awadesh Singh. उन्होंने कहा कि भारत सरकार फंस गई है। अब देखिए, मेरा तो सारा जीवन इसी काम में गुजरा है तो आप नहीं समझेंगे कि मैं कोई ऐसा कच्चा आदमी हूं कि जो ऐसा काम करूं जिसमें कि मैं फंस जाऊं और मेरी सरकार फंस जाए। और विदेश मंत्रालय में भी जो लोग काम करते हैं, उन्होंने भी विचार किया है, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने किया है, औरों ने किया है जो लोग लगे हुए हैं दोनों तरफ के। हम नहीं चाहते कि किसी दलदल में फंस जाय। इरादा यह है कि जल्दी से जल्दी काम उनका समाप्त हो जाय और सही-सलामत हमारे लोग आ जाएं, वहां की जनता में अमन हो जाय। आप समझते हैं और फिर आपने यह कहा कि हमारे गले में हड्डी अटक गयी है। मुझे तो लगा नहीं कि अटक गयी हो। आपको खबर लगी हो तो बताइएगा, निकालने की कोशिश करेंगे।... (**व्यवधान**)...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : यह मैं भी समझता हूं और पूरा देश भी चाहता है कि फंसे नहीं। हमारा देश फंसे नहीं, आपकी भी इच्छा है, हम सब की इच्छा है, आपकी इच्छा तो होनी ही चाहिए। लेकिन कल की यह श्रीलंका में टना के बाद, जो दहलाने वाली घटना है, उसके बाद भी मंत्री जी की अपनी वही गति है और वही जो धारा है, मैं समझता था कि कल की घटना के बाद से कुछ शिक्षा मिलनी चाहिए और मैं यह आशा करता था कि नए संदर्भ में कुछ यहां मंत्री जी का बयान होगा। लेकिन लगता है कि... (**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : अभी उनका बयान खतम नहीं हुआ है।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : कैसे हड्डी फंस गयी, यह मैं एक मिनट में कहना चाहता हूं। हड्डी कैसे फंस गयी, इन्होंने कहा कि हमको लगती नहीं हड्डी, इसलिए फंस गई है कि न तो वहां की सिंहली जनता चाहती है उसको और न तमिलियन लोग चाहते हैं। तो दोनों एग्रीमेंट को चाहते नहीं क्योंकि पहले ही दिन "प्रथम ग्रासे मच्छिका पाता" जिस दिन समझौता हुआ, उसी दिन प्रधान मंत्री पर हमला हुआ। यह इस बात का प्रतीक है कि कोई चाहता ही नहीं है, न सिंहली लोग चाहते हैं और प्रभाकरण का भी रेस्पोंस वैसा नहीं है। तो जिन लोगों के लिए आपने समझौता किया, दोनों ही नहीं चाहते हैं तो आप कहीं फंस गये हैं। . . . . (**व्यवधान**) . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : यह आपकी राय है, उनको बोलने दीजिये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आपको तो हमें प्रोटक्शन करनी चाहिए और महोदय . . . (**व्यवधान**) . . . . क मिनट सुन लीजिए, बहुत इम्पोर्टेण्ट सवाल है। यह मान लिजिए, हमारी सेना वहां गई और हथियार डलवा दिये और वहां से कहा कि अब जा ए एमग्रीमेंट के मुताबिक और जैसा 30 जुलाई को जयवर्धने ने कहा—हम यू० स० ए० को बुला सकते हैं, इजरायल को भी बुला सकते हैं और बुला लिया तो फिर हमारे लोग, तमिलों की रक्षा के लिए गए थे ताकि उनको शांति मिले, वे सुख-चैन से रहें, उनका क्या होगा?

श्री के० नटवर सिंह : देखिए, मैं बड़ी नम्रता पूर्वक आपके सामने रख रहा हूं। अगर जो कुछ मैंने कहा है पिछले टे में, उसको गौर से सुना हो तो आपके सब सवालों का जवाब मैंने दे दिया है और जो संकोच है, संदेह है, शुबह है, उस पर हमने खूब विचार किया। देखि, दर्जनों लोग इस पर काम कर रहे हैं रोजाना, कई महकमों में काम कर रहे हैं और उनका काम यही है, ड्यूटी यही है कि जो नुक्ता-चीनी आपने की है, वह करें और उसका, जवाब निकालें। अब मुझे पता नहीं है, आपको कुछ तजुर्बा है कि नहीं, सरकार में काम कैसे होता है और अगर होता तो यह सवाल आप उठाते नहीं कि सरकार में कैसे काम होता है।

Finally I come to Mr. Chitta Basu. . . . (*Interruptions*).

हम चाहते हैं कि भूतकाल की बात न करें, भविष्य की बात करें। हम भी चाहते हैं कि भविष्य की करें। We must look to the future, not to the past Shri Chitta Basu said there were both positive and negative aspects of it and there should be neither euphoria nor condemnation. I would broadly respectfully agree with what he has said. There should be no euphoria or condemnation. I am only aware of positive aspects and if there are any negative aspects which I have left unmentioned, I would like to be corrected. But by and large, the House will agree that this agreement has brought an end to strife and discord in Sri Lanka and I think, we should all join in thanks-giving that this has happened. As I said the other day, in this accord, there are no vanquished; there are only victors. Thank you very much.

SHRI V. GOPALSWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, our hon. Minister says that we should look to the future. I did seek a specific clarification from the hon. Minister in my speech day-before-yesterday, because the agreement says that the moment Mr. Jayewardene or anybody else who becomes the head of the Sri Lankan Government asks the Indian Army to withdraw the Indian Army has to withdraw from Sri Lanka. from the northern and eastern provinces, Now, the militants are being disarmed. What is the guarantee that the Tamil will not have to face the same old repression and violence? I am not speaking hypothetically. What happened yesterday? A dastardly attack inside the Sri Lankan Parliament which is a manifestation of the monstrous racist mentality which has been injected. a venom in the minds of the Sinhala masses over the last three decades. Again if they attack the Tamils, what is the guarantee

[Shri V. Gopalswamy]

for the security of the Tamils once the Indian Army is withdrawn? This is the important question. I put this question to the hon. Mininster but he has not answered it.

Secondly, he said about repatriation. There was agreement in 1964, of course. It was renewed again. But the Sri Lankan Government has not honoured its commitment in regard to giving citizenship to the number of persons specified in that agreement. That is why Mrs. Gandhi said in 1981 'No more repatriation; it is the duty of the Sri Lankan Government to give citizenship to these persons'. But now, you are taking back 200,000 Tamils who have been there for more than 150 years. What is it that has compelled you to take back these persons and equate them with the refugees who have come from there? Mr. Vice-Chairman, because he said I should co-operate, I co-operated. Then, he said about Mr. Prabagaran and the LTTE. Of course, he is entitled to say that he has got more rapport with Mr. Prabhakaran and the LTTE than others. All right. But he has evaded my question. I asked him whether the LTTE and Mr. Prabhakaran agreed to the package proposals of the Government. He has not answered this question. He said that he has great respect for Mr. Prabhakaran, for his constructive approach and all those things. These are all only phrases. But the important question is whether he agreed to your package proposals. Mr. Prabakaran himself has said in Jaffna that the agreement was imposed on them and that they did not agree with the package proposals. I wanted to know whether Mr. Prabakaran was kept in Delhi incommunicado. I wanted to know whether any Pressmen were permitted to meet him. I myself had the experience which I recounted. Therefore, I would like to request the hon. Minister to clarify these points.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Now, Sir, in regard to Mr. Prabakaran, I happen to know him rather well. He was present at the ceremony where the laying down of arms took place. Obviously, if he had not agreed, he would not have come there. It is as simple as that. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. He has co-operated with us. He has made known his political views and we know, those views.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He has said that the agreement was imposed on them. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): This is what the hon. Minister feels. You may feel otherwise. He says that the fact that he was present at the ceremony shows that he was co-operating.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The question is whether he agreed to your package proposals before you put your signature on the agreement.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: He has made a public statement. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: The agreement was signed on the 29th July. The LTTE was fully aware of the provisions of the agreement when the agreement was signed. They were kept fully in the picture. I do not want...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Even a copy was not handed over to them. It was read out by Indian officials.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Since when have you become the spokesman for the LTTE? Have they authorised you to ask questions?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Why not?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We are directly dealing with them. We are dealing with the LTTE....

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: You are answerable to the Parliament. What are you talking? (*Interruptions*).

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): The Members of Parliament have every right to represent the cause of the people. I think Mr. Gopalsamy was within his right to represent the cause of the Tamilians in Sri Lanka if he felt that

way. Even if you are dealing with the LTTE directly, he has full right to represent their cause.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I have extremely patiently answered this question repeatedly. Prof. Gopalsamy wants...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am not a Professor, Sir.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am not surprised if you are not a Professor. What I want to say is that we are in the midst of a delicate and sensitive exercise. I want to use my word very carefully. You don't have the responsibility that I carry.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am very sorry about this observation. He cannot carry the monopoly of the responsibility. We are responsible members. We have the responsibility to protect more than you have. We are concerned about the welfare of the Tamilians in Sri Lanka more than you. You should not make an observation like that. I am very sorry about the observation.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I will rephrase what I said. What I am trying to say is that naturally as a Government we are privy to certain information which would not be in the public interest to disclose here. I am not suggesting that the hon. Member is not a responsible Member of the Parliament, I never said so. On the contrary, you are perfectly entitled to ask questions and I am perfectly entitled to give information which is in the public interest. I have been dealing with such questions not in this House but from there for the last 31 years. So I have some knowledge of what to impart and what not to impart. I do not mean to say that you should not ask me questions. All other Members in the House have listened to me and they are generally satisfied You want to labour a particular point which I have said is not in the public interest for me to comment on.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I have asked the question about security. He has not answered that question.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I would reply, I would like to satisfy the hon. Member as far as possible. One of the paragraphs, 1.5, of the Agreement says:

> "Conscious of the necessity of strengthening the forces contributing to the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Sri Lanka, and preserving its character as multi-ethnic, multi-lingual and multi-religious plural society, in which all citizens can live in equality, safety and harmony, and prosper fulfil their aspirations;"

We undertake this and if the agreement is not fully implemented the Indian army will not withdraw.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: Sir, just one point. This is a matter of national importance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, please. I have given you full opportunity. Please cooperate with me. (*Interruptions*). Now special mentions.

SPECIAL MENTIONS

Demand to set up Tribunal for adjudicating wage disputes between employers and the Seamen

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, following a wage dispute between the employers and the Forward Seamen's Union of India, Calcutta High Court ordered for setting up of a Tribunal for adjudicating the wage disputes of the Indian Seamen, by 6th April, 1987. The Central Government was directed on 30th March, 1987 by the hon. High Court to refer the dispute between the seamen and their employer under section 150 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 to the appropriate Tribunal provided the disputes were covered by the appropriate provisions. The Central Government has recently informed that the disputes are covered under section 150 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, but as yet no tribunal has been set up by